EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON THE CO₂ TO WATER HEAT EXCHANGER PERFORMANCE NEAR THE CO₂ CRITICAL POINT
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ABSTRACT
Supercritical CO₂ (S-CO₂) cycle is considered as one of the promising candidates for the next generation nuclear reactor power conversion system due to relatively high efficiency at low turbine inlet temperature. It also has simple layout and small footprint due to compact turbomachinery and heat exchangers. The major characteristic of a S-CO₂ cycle is the small compression work due to dynamic thermodynamic property variation near the critical point. As the S-CO₂ cycle efficiency is highly dependent on the compressor inlet condition, the performance of precooler must be investigated thoroughly as the precooler conditions the compressor inlet condition. For such application, conventional shell and tube heat exchanger can be considered. To investigate the CO₂ heat transfer near the critical point to the water acting as the ultimate heat sink, the experimental data obtained from S-CO₂ Pressurizing Experiment (SCO₂PE) were utilized. SCO₂PE is composed of a canned motor type CO₂ compressor, an expansion valve and a spiral tube heat exchanger. The conventional LMTD method was utilized for the spiral tube heat exchanger design evaluation. However, the heat exchanger performance differs from the design point as the CO₂ specific heat changes vigorously near the critical point. To assess the CO₂ heat transfer more precisely, the average Nusselt number is calculated and compared with the existing correlations.
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1. INTRODUCTION
As the concern for the global climate change is gradually increasing, the nuclear energy is considered as one of the realistic alternative to reduce the CO₂ emission. Among the next generation nuclear reactor designs, the Sodium-cooled Fast Reactor (SFR) has been actively researched with abundant operating experience in several leading countries. Recently, 150MWₑ Prototype Generation IV Sodium-cooled Fast Reactor (PG-SFR) is being developed by the Korean Atomic Energy Research Institute (KAERI). The current design of PG-SFR adopts a superheated steam Rankine cycle for its power conversion system. However, a possibility of having violent sodium-water reaction in SFR requires a safety system such as a double wall steam generator or a waveguide sensor visualization technology to mitigate the consequences from an accident. To prevent the sodium-water reaction inherently, a Supercritical CO₂ (S-CO₂) cycle is considered as the promising alternative to replace the sodium water reaction with the mild sodium-CO₂ reaction.
A S-CO₂ cycle is receiving attention as an alternative to the steam Rankine cycle due to the benefits summarized below.
Figure 1. S-CO₂ Recompression cycle layout

- Competitive efficiency under low turbine inlet temperature
- Simple layout to achieve high efficiency
- Small footprint with compact turbomachinery and heat exchangers
- Less complexity in purification system requirements compared to the steam Rankine cycle

As shown in Figure 1, a S-CO₂ recompression cycle is considered as one of the most efficient layouts. Previous studies showed that the S-CO₂ cycle efficiency is highly sensitive to the compressor inlet condition which is close to the critical point (30.98°C, 7.3773MPa) [1]. Therefore, evaluation of the main compressor as well as the precooler performances are essential for realizing the S-CO₂ cycle design. Among various types of heat exchanger, the Printed Circuit Heat Exchanger (PCHE) has been widely utilized for the S-CO₂ cycle due to a wide range of operational temperature and pressure. In general, operating conditions of recuperators and CO₂ heaters in the cycle are usually appropriate for PCHE due to high pressure difference between hot and cold fluids. However, several alternative heat exchangers including Shell and tube type Heat Exchanger (SHE) has been investigated due to relatively low pressure difference in the precooler. The heat transfer analysis results for water to CO₂ in the precooler under the condition of largely varying CO₂ thermodynamic properties are presented in this paper.

2. Supercritical CO₂ Pressurizing Experiment (SCO₂PE) and experiment data

2.1. SCO₂PE and Spiral Tube Heat Exchanger (STHE) description

To investigate the CO₂ flow and heat transfer characteristics near the critical point, the Supercritical CO₂ Pressurizing Equipment (SCO₂PE) was designed and constructed by KAIST research team. As shown in Figure 2, SCO₂PE consists of a low pressure ratio canned motor type CO₂ compressor, an expansion valve, an electric heater, and a Spiral Tube Heat Exchanger (STHE). In addition, the booster pump and venting valve were installed to charge and vent CO₂,
respectively. In the cooling water tank, the chiller is connected to cool water. The measurement devices are installed to measure the inlet and outlet condition of STHE and CO$_2$ compressor.

Figure 2. SCO$_2$PE picture (left) and schematic layout (right)

Figure 3. Spiral Tube Heat Exchanger (STHE) type pre cooler (courtesy of Sentry Equipment Corp.)
The experimental procedure of SCO₂PE is as below.
- After vacuuming with a vacuum pump, CO₂ in a tank is transported to the main loop with the booster pump.
- While charging CO₂, the mass in the loop is monitored and heated to the supercritical state through an electric heater.
- Supercritical CO₂ is compressed with the compressor and expanded through an expansion valve. Then, CO₂ is cooled near to the critical point in the precooler.

The picture and the internal geometry of the STHE is shown in Figure 3. Water in the shell side is pumped from the cooling water tank which cools the high pressure CO₂ in the tube side flowing near the critical point. As shown in Figure 4, the properties vary dramatically near the critical point. Several design parameters are listed in Table I. Due to the limited information from the manufacturing company, some parameters are assumed based on the heat exchanger geometry.

Table I. Spiral Tube Heat Exchanger (STHE) design parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Tube (CO₂)</th>
<th>Shell (water)</th>
<th>Correction factor, F</th>
<th>Heat load, kW</th>
<th>Heat transfer area, m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design ( T_{\text{in}} ), °C</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>23.41</td>
<td>2.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design ( T_{\text{out}} ), °C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow rate, kg/s</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>( N_{\text{tube}} )</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the LMTD methods, the heat transfer rates from the hot fluid to cold fluid in the heat exchanger can be expressed as below, respectively.

\[ q = UAF \Delta T_{lm} \]  

(1)

F is log-mean temperature difference correction factor. This dimensionless parameter is dependent on the number of transfer unit (NTU), the flow configuration and the heat capacity ratio between hot and cold side. From the design parameters provided from the manufacturing company, the corresponding value of F is calculated and shown in Table I.

### 2.2. Experiment data and uncertainty analysis

![Figure 5. Experiment data case](image)

**Table II. Experiment data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp. No</th>
<th>( \dot{m}_{\text{tube}} ), kg/s</th>
<th>( T_{\text{in, tube}} ), °C</th>
<th>( P_{\text{in, tube}} ), MPa</th>
<th>( T_{\text{out, tube}} ), °C</th>
<th>( P_{\text{in, tube}} ), MPa</th>
<th>( \dot{m}_{\text{shell}} ), kg/s</th>
<th>( T_{\text{in, shell}} ), °C</th>
<th>( T_{\text{out, shell}} ), °C</th>
<th>( \Delta P_{\text{shell}} ), kPa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>32.17</td>
<td>7.566</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>7.403</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>7.949</td>
<td>28.78</td>
<td>7.699</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>7.938</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>7.796</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table III. Measurement accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor type</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>+0.2°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure transmitter</td>
<td>± 0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential pressure gauge (CO₂)</td>
<td>± 0.065%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential pressure gauge (water)</td>
<td>± 0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow meter (CO₂)</td>
<td>± 0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow meter (water)</td>
<td>± 0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several experiment data from SCO₂PE were acquired and shown in Fig. 5 and Table II. The heat exchanging experiments were conducted in various conditions including below and over the critical point. Before evaluating heat transfer rate from the experimental data, the uncertainty analysis was performed. Due to the nonlinear property change of CO₂ near the critical point, the measurement uncertainties can influence the heat transfer analysis. The measurement device type and accuracy are listed in Table III. The uncertainties of enthalpy, transferred heat, Reynolds number and Prandtl number can be derived as below [3].

\[
\frac{\omega_h}{h} = \sqrt{\left( \frac{\delta h}{\delta T} \omega_T \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\delta h}{\delta P} \omega_P \right)^2}
\]

\[
\frac{\omega_Q}{Q} = \sqrt{\left( \frac{\omega_r}{m} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\omega_{hs}}{h_{in}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\omega_{hw}}{h_{out}} \right)^2}
\]

\[
\frac{\omega_{Re}}{Re} = \sqrt{\left( \frac{\omega_r}{m} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\omega_{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^2}
\]

\[
\frac{\omega_{Pr}}{Pr} = \sqrt{\left( \frac{\omega_k}{k} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\omega_{cp}}{c_p} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\omega_{\mu}}{\mu} \right)^2}
\]
Table IV. Enthalpy and heat uncertainty analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp.</th>
<th>$h_{co2}$</th>
<th>$h_{water}$</th>
<th>$Q_{co2}$</th>
<th>$Q_{water}$</th>
<th>$Re_{CO2}$</th>
<th>$Pr_{CO2}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#101</td>
<td>2.24 - 58.29</td>
<td>0.7 - 2.97</td>
<td>4.83 - 58.29</td>
<td>2.94 - 3.1</td>
<td>9.9 - 25.3</td>
<td>26.8 - 134.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#201-203</td>
<td>0.35 - 0.4</td>
<td>0.73 - 1.33</td>
<td>0.55 - 0.56</td>
<td>1.59 - 1.62</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0 - 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#301-303</td>
<td>0.33 - 0.36</td>
<td>0.68 - 1.35</td>
<td>0.51 - 0.52</td>
<td>1.57 - 1.60</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.4 - 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#401-403</td>
<td>0.41 - 0.56</td>
<td>0.51 - 1.34</td>
<td>0.69 - 0.72</td>
<td>1.50 - 1.53</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.8 - 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#501-503</td>
<td>0.17 - 0.2</td>
<td>0.53 - 1.33</td>
<td>0.3 - 0.31</td>
<td>1.50 - 1.53</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7 - 1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(unit : %)

Table IV clearly shows that the uncertainty of parameters such as enthalpy, transferred heat, Reynolds number and Prandtl number near the CO$_2$ critical point is distinctively higher than other cases. Except for Exp. #101, the uncertainties are comparably reasonably low although the operating conditions are still near the critical point. Among the accumulated experiment cases, the uncertainties of Exp. 501 - 503 are the lowest.

2.3. Heat transfer analysis

Based on equation (2), the overall heat transfer coefficient can be calculated from the experiment data with the value of heat transfer area and log mean temperature difference. The heat is transferred from CO$_2$ to the hot wall through convection, conduction through the tube wall and convection from the tube wall to the shell side water. If the fouling factor is ignored, the overall heat transfer coefficient, $U$ can be expressed as below.

$$ \frac{1}{U} = \frac{1}{h_o} + \frac{d_o}{2k_w} \ln \left( \frac{d_o}{d_i} \right) + \frac{d_o}{h_i d_i} $$

(6)

where $h_o$, $h_i$, $d_o$, $d_i$, and $k_w$ are tube outside heat transfer coefficient, tube inside heat transfer coefficient, tube outer diameter, tube inner diameter and wall thermal conductivity, respectively.

For the analysis of heat transfer in a pipe is quite straightforward. The average Nusselt number is calculated from Gnielinski correlation [4]. The Reynolds number of CO$_2$ varies from 413,000 - 30,000,000 and the fluid can be regarded as turbulent.

$$ Nu = \frac{(f / 8)(Re-1000)Pr}{1.00 + 12.7(f / 8)^{1/2}(Pr^{2/3} - 1)} $$

(7)

$$ f = \frac{1}{(1.82 \log_{10} Re - 1.64)^2} $$

(8)

where $2,300 < Re < 5 \times 10^6$ and $1.0 < Pr < 10^6$.

However, the heat transfer in a shell needs more consideration to simplify the complicated shell geometry. To calculate the Reynolds number of water flow, the fluid velocity and the hydraulic diameter must be determined. To calculate the fluid velocity, the cross sectional area was simplified as below.

$$ A_{ex,shell} = \frac{V_{shell} - V_{tube}}{L_{shell}} $$

(9)
where $A_{\text{cross,shell}}$, $V_{\text{shell}}$, $V_{\text{tube}}$ and $L_{\text{shell}}$ are shell side cross sectional area, shell side volume, tube side volume and shell side length, respectively. The water velocity in the shell is quite low as the cross sectional area is large. The Reynolds number of water flow varies from 290 - 380. The cross flow in the shell with the staggered tubes is calculated with the following correlation [5].

$$Nu = 0.71Re^{0.5}Pr^{0.36} \quad (10)$$

where the correlation is valid for $100 < Re < 1000$.

From this analysis, the overall heat transfer coefficient is calculated and compared with the experiment data as shown in Figure 6. In general, the calculated overall heat transfer coefficient, $U_{\text{cal}}$ is higher than the experiment data.

Table V. Thermal resistance analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Heat, kW</th>
<th>$U_{\text{cal}}$, kW/m²·K</th>
<th>$R_{\text{shell}}/U$, %</th>
<th>$R_{\text{tube}}/U$, %</th>
<th>$R_{\text{wall}}/U$, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#101</td>
<td>16.93-17.53</td>
<td>2.36 - 2.41</td>
<td>82.4 - 83.4</td>
<td>2.2 - 3.3</td>
<td>14.3 - 14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#201-203</td>
<td>10.34-13.78</td>
<td>2.12 - 2.30</td>
<td>68.7 - 71.9</td>
<td>12.4 - 18.3</td>
<td>12.9 - 15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#301-303</td>
<td>10.14-13.82</td>
<td>1.99 - 2.44</td>
<td>69.9 - 73.1</td>
<td>12.1 - 17.9</td>
<td>12.1 - 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#401-403</td>
<td>5.14-7.9</td>
<td>1.21 - 1.58</td>
<td>77.1 - 81.3</td>
<td>9.3 - 15.3</td>
<td>7.3 - 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#501-503</td>
<td>4.89-6.05</td>
<td>1.07 - 1.30</td>
<td>66.6 - 73.3</td>
<td>19.1 - 26.8</td>
<td>6.5 - 7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Correction factor from the experiment cases

Table VI. Correction factor analysis
The thermal resistances of test cases are listed in Table V and the largest thermal resistance was observed from the shell side. While the inlet temperature and pressure were maintained for each test group (e.g. Case #201 - 203), the mass flow rate of tube and shell sides were varied. Consequently, the amount of transferred heat in each case varied when the mass flow rate was varied.

The correction factor of experiments is shown in Table VI. The correction factor is dependent on the number of heat transfer (NTU), the flow configuration and the heat capacity ratio between hot and cold streams (R). For a heat exchanger with well-defined geometry such as counter current flow or parallel flow, the correction factor for the corresponding condition is evaluated. However, the correction factor of a complex geometry heat exchanger cannot be evaluated. As shown in the left of Figure 6, the calculated correction factor is close to the design point under the similar number of transfer unit (NTU) condition. Based on the open literature correlation, the correction factor is calculated to be in between 0.25 - 0.4.

CONCLUSIONS

Among S-CO₂ heat exchangers in the S-CO₂ cycle, the precooler operating pressure is the lowest compared to other type of heat exchangers and the hot and cold side pressure difference is the lowest. A Printed Circuit Heat Exchanger (PCHE) has been widely utilized for the S-CO₂ heat exchangers but high cost of PCHE can limit the S-CO₂ cycle application. Therefore, an alternative to PCHE for the S-CO₂ cycle is being investigated. A Spiral Tube Heat Exchanger (STHE) is installed in the S-CO₂ Pressurizing Experiment (SCO₂PE) and the preliminary test results were obtained to assess STHE for the precooler performance. From the experiments, thermal resistance of water is larger than that of CO₂. If the shell and tube heat exchanger is utilized for the precooler of S-CO₂ cycle, the heat transfer of shell side must be precisely modeled for the better design and performance prediction.

The design and performance of a Spiral Tube Heat Exchanger were investigated with LMTD method. Based on the design and geometry parameters of STHE, the heat transfer rate was calculated and compared to the experiment data in various cases. From the overall heat transfer rate difference between the experiment data and calculated value, the correction factor was calculated for several different conditions. The correction factor from the experiments varies between 0.25 to 0.4.
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